

TED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

DINKELBORG, Ludger, et al. Group Art Unit.: 3736

Serial No.: 09/508,972 Examiner: LACYK, John P.

Filed: May 24, 2000 :

Title: PROCESS FOR THERAPEUTIC TREATMENT OF PROLIFERATIVE DISEASES

## REPLY

**Assistant Commissioner for Patents** Washington, D.C. 20231

SIR:

In response to the Office Action mailed on October 2, 2002, applicants elect Group II, containing claims 3-29. The election is made with traverse. Claims of Group I and claims of Group II are not drawn to two separate inventions. The Office Action alleges that claims of Group I are drawn to a process for therapeutic treatment, while alleging that claims of Group II are drawn to a specific structural make-up of a radioactive substance. Applicants respectfully disagree. Numerous claims of Group II are also drawn to the same therapeutic process as claims of Group I. Indeed, numerous claims of Group II are dependent on claims of Group I. Additionally, The Office Action did not establish that it would pose an undue burden on the Patent Office to search the full scope of the claimed invention. Reconsideration of the election requirement is respectfully requested.



The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908 Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969 Attorneys for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. Arlington Courthouse Plaza I 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400 Arlington, Virginia 22201

Direct Dial: 703-812-5331 Facsimile: 703-243-6410

Filed: October 28, 2002

AJZ/CH(pdr)K:\SCH\1737\REPLY OCT 2002.DOC